

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Note to Examiner

Applicants note that claims 26-27, which were submitted in the amendment dated December 29, 2008, were not examined in the current Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request an examination of claims 26-27.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura**

Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Number 2004/0059914 issued to Karaoguz dated March 25, 2004 in view of U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0141594 A1 issued to MacKenzie dated October 3, 2002, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,420,596 issued to Niimura on September 2, 2008.

Applicants respectively traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons. First, applicants' claim 1 recites,

"an authentication device that authenticates a computing device, in communication with the authentication device, through employment of a determination that a current location of the authentication device matches an initial location of the authentication device;

wherein one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device;"

As stated in the Final Office Action, Karaoguz and Mackenzie do **not** teach or suggest "wherein one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are erased via a cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device", as recited in applicants' claim 1. Moreover, applicants note that the proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura does **not** teach or

suggest "wherein one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device" either.

Instead, Niimura discloses that main controller 110 erases key data if main controller 110 determines that the user has turned off the power supply, as stated in column 3, lines 59-65. In other words, the user, i.e., a person, must take an affirmative step to turn off the power before the key data are erased.

By contrast, applicants' claim 1 does not require a user to turn off the power supply in order to erase key data. Applicants' claim 1 requires the private keys to be erased "via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device". In other words, 1) there must be an attempt to place the authentication device in motion and then 2) the private keys are erased "via an automatic cutoff of power". Thus, Niimura is missing the "erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device" elements, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Second, the Examiner has asserted that Niimura teaches applicants' claim 1 limitation based on FIG. 3, steps 303-304, and column 4, lines 21-25, in which the main controller 110 erases the key data if the user has turned of the alteration preventing function.

Applicants disagree. This is because Niimura discloses in column 3, lines 11-14,

"The alteration preventing function can be made valid (turned on) or invalid (turned off) during a period in which the power supply of the image sensing apparatus 10 is ON."

In other words, the power supply must be placed in an "on" position before the alteration preventing function can operate. Again, Niimura is missing the "erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device" elements, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of the proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura is that one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are not erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device.

Therefore the proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-13 and 23-27 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 14 and 22 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by the proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura. For example, claims 14 and 22 recite, "wherein one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device". The proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura does not teach or suggest this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 14 and 22 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 15-21 depend from claim 14, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejection Under Karaoguz, MacKenzie, Niimura and Wheeler

Claims 7 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz in view of MacKenzie, and further in view of Niimura, and furthermore in view of U. S. Patent Application Number 2007/0088950 issued to Wheeler dated April 19, 2007.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

This rejection is based on the rejection under Karaoguz, MacKenzie and Niimura being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein one or more private keys employable for encryption and/or decryption of information are erased via an automatic cutoff of power upon an attempt to move the authentication device" as recited in applicants' independent claims 1, 14 and 22, the proposed combination of Karaoguz, MacKenzie, Niimura and Wheeler does not supply this missing element. Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitation.

14


LUC-469/Dombkowski 11-16

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


James Milton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: March 26, 2009

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC
Customer Number 47382